(2) THE DANGEROUS DRUGS (MADRAS AMENDMENT) BILL[a], 1950 (L.A. BILL NO. 14 OF 1950).

THE HON. SRI N. SANJEEVA REDDI :—" Mr. Chairman, Sir, I beg to move—

'*That the Dangerous Drugs (Madras Amendment) Bill,* 1950 (*L.A. Bill No.* 14 *of* 1950), *as passed by the Assembly, be taken into consideration.*'

" Sir, this is a very simple amendment, which authorises the Prohibition Department authorities to investigate into offences under this Act. Hitherto they had the authority as excise officers. But now, their name is changed from Excise to Prohibition Officers. Hence this amending Bill is necessitated."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" The question is—

' That the Dangerous Drugs (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1950 (L.A. Bill No. 14 of 1950), as passed by the Assembly, be taken into consideration '."

The motion was carried.

Clause 2 was put and carried.

Clause 1 was put and carried.

The preamble was put and carried.

THE HON. SRI N. SANJEEVA REDDI :—" Sir, I move—

'*That the Dangerous Drugs (Madras Amendment) Bill,* 1950 (*L.A. Bill No.* 14 *of* 1950), *as passed by the Assembly, be passed into law* '."

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was passed into law.

(3) THE ANDHRA UNIVERSITY (AMENDMENT) BILL [b], 1950 (L.A. BILL NO. 16 OF 1950).

THE HON. SRI K. MADHAVA MENON :—" Mr. Chairman, Sir, I beg to move—

'*That the Andhra University (Amendment) Bill,* 1950 (*L.A. Bill No.* 16 *of* 1950), *as passed by the Assembly be taken into consideration.*'

" Sir, the Maharaja of Jeypore, who was the most munificent donor for that University, as pro-Chancellor, had the right to nominate one member to the Syndicate. In 1944, as he promised to contribute one lakh of rupees every year, in view of his munificent donation, the Senate unanimously recommended to Government that the Maharajah may be allowed to nominate two members to the Syndicate instead of one. So during the Advisers' regime, in 1944, an Act was passed which enabled him to nominate two

---

[a] Printed as Appendix II on pages 159 infra.

[b] Printed as Appendix III on page 160 infra.

7th August 1950] [Sri K. Madhava Menon]

members instead of one. When the Advisers Act was re-enacted in 1948, the number of nominees of the Maharaja to the Syndicate was reduced from two to one. The Senate of the Andhra University has again unanimously recommended to restore the number to two in fairness to the Maharaja who has been and continues to be the biggest donor of the University. The Government think that there is much force in the unanimous recommendation of the Senate and have brought forward this Bill to restore the number of the Maharaja's nominees to the Syndicate to two." 11-45 a.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" The question is—

'That the Andhra University (Amendment) Bill, 1950 (L.A. Bill No. 16 of 1950), as passed by the Assembly, be taken into consideration'."

The motion was carried.

Clauses 2 and 1 and the preamble were put and carried.

THE HON. SRI K. MADHAVA MENON :—" Sir, I move—

*'That the Bill be passed into law'.*"

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" The questions is—

'That the Andhra University (Amendment) Bill, 1950 (L.A. Bill No. 16 of 1950), as passed by the Assembly, be passed into law'."

The motion was carried.

## (4) THE INDIAN CRIMINAL LAW (MADRAS) AMENDMENT BILL[a], 1950 (L.A. BILL NO. 17 OF 1950).

THE HON. SRI K. MADHAVA MENON :—" Sir, I move—

*'That the Indian Criminal Law (Madras) Amendment Bill,* 1950 (*L.A. Bill No.* 17 *of* 1950), *as passed by the Assembly, be taken into consideration.'*

" The Criminal Law Amendment Act was a much-hated Act during the time of the British regime. It was very sparingly used subsequent to the attainment of independence. Certain circumstances in the country necessitated the use of the Act. Hon. Members know that the Communist Party and the various organizations which owed allegiance to it were banned under the Act. One of the arrested persons moved in the Supreme Court that certain sections of the Criminal Law Amendment Act were *ultra vires* of the Fundamental Rights guaranteed in the Constitution of India. The Supreme Court did not give any decision, as the question raised there was disposed of on a technical ground. We examined whether any sections of the Act contravened or were inconsistent with the Constitution. Apart from the question whether they were inconsistent with the Constitution or not, the Government themselves felt it necessary to liberalize certain sections in the interests of natural justice. With that idea, we

[a] Printed as Appendix IV on page 160 infra.